

Henry J Martocchio
813 graham rd
South Windsor ct 06074
860-432-4567 hjmservices@yahoo.com
Monday, March 14, 2016 Too the Judiciary Committee's JUDtestimony@cga.ct.gov

Not in support of **Raised Bill No. 5608**

AN ACT CONCERNING A GRANDPARENT'S RIGHT OF VISITATION WITH A GRANDCHILD.

I but I sit here today for discriminations' From grandparents and the courts stealing my child and trying to Fraud a Fit Father of his Full rights..

Introduction The Americans with Disabilities Act to this day has not been full implemented 26 years after the congress passage and mandates of this civil right and due process right that the state actors and player do not want and will not give. But we sit here today hearing grandparent wishes to over rule parents rights.

Under the ADA of 1990 shows = No administrative compliance = no ADA compliance = all persons and attorneys have been, are, and will continue to be excluded from participation, denied the benefits of services programs activities of Conn, and discriminated against by reason of disability by the public entity known as the Conn services to the Public.

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) prohibits discrimination against persons with disabilities in the areas of employment, public accommodations, state and local government services, and telecommunications. Both public and private hospitals and health care facilities must provide their services to people with disabilities in a nondiscriminatory manner. To do so, they may have to modify their policies and procedures, provide auxiliary aids and services for effective communication, remove barriers from existing facilities,

ADA OBJECTION PROTEST COMPLAINT

Demands for REMEDIES/on/or

About ADA All ADA Program Manager's & State of Conn Judicial Branch and All State Departments of Conn that Services the Public.

This is a Request/ACTION OF Relief of Remedies for cases, In re Nathan R. M. H12-cp11-014212-a, Martocchio V. Savoir Et Al. FA 06-4006261, A.C. 36368, A. C. 31363, AC 33597, AC 35741, SC 110192, SC 140383 and all past Tolland probate And the Greater Windsor matters and all services of state vendor and

State Services to the public.

PLEASE look to the 1991 Regs coupled with the TAM for their preamble as best explanation of "public entities" ""***responsibilities***""!!!

From that, you can best tell if the Conn" was, is, will be tomorrow", compliant to Title II of the ADA and for subcontractors of state they hold not only Title II but also Title III obligations .

Raised Bill No. 5608

AN ACT CONCERNING A GRANDPARENT'S RIGHT OF VISITATION WITH A GRANDCHILD.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened:

Section 1. Subsection (b) of section 46b-59 of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective October 1, 2016*):

(b) (1) A grandparent may submit a verified petition to the Superior Court for the right of visitation with any minor child. Such petition shall include specific and good-faith allegations that (A) a parent-like relationship exists between the grandparent and the minor child and denial of visitation would cause real and significant harm; or (B) compelling circumstances exist that overcome the presumption that the parental decision to deny such visitation is in the child's best interest. Subject to subsection (e) of this section, the court shall grant the right of visitation with any minor child to a grandparent if the court finds after hearing and by clear and convincing evidence that (i) a parent-like relationship exists between the grandparent and the minor child and denial of visitation would cause real and significant harm; or (ii) compelling circumstances exist that overcome the presumption that the parental decision to deny such visitation is in the child's best interest.

[(b)] (2) Any person, other than a grandparent, may submit a verified petition to the Superior Court for the right of visitation with any minor child. Such petition shall include specific and good-faith allegations that [(1)] a parent-like relationship exists between the person and the minor child [,] and [(2)] denial of visitation would cause real and significant harm. Subject to subsection (e) of this section, the court shall grant the right of visitation with any minor child to any person if the court finds after hearing and by clear and convincing evidence that

a parent-like relationship exists between the person and the minor child and denial of visitation would cause real and significant harm.

The Supreme Court of Alabama in *Ex parte E.R.G.*, 73 So. 3d 634, 86 A.L.R.6th 651 (Ala. 2011), cert. denied, 132 S. Ct. 1535, 182 L. Ed. 2d 161, (2012), held that a grandparent visitation statute violated the fundamental due process rights of parents and therefore was unenforceable, by not including a presumption in favor of parents when deciding questions of visitation, by looking only to the best interests of the child, and by substituting the judge for the parents in applying the best-interests standard, and also by not requiring a showing of a compelling state interest in awarding visitation to grandparents or a showing that application of the statute was the least restrictive means of achieving any state interest. This annotation collects and analyzes all cases that have addressed the validity of grandparent visitation statutes.

The court noted that the State's compelling interest is limited to overruling the decisions of unfit parents. Because parents are presumed to act in the best interests of their children, the court noted that the law also presumes parental "care, custody, and control" to be superior to that of third persons under ordinary circumstances including cases involving visitation with nonparents.

To be constitutional, the court noted the Act must infringe upon the parent's right only to the extent necessary to protect a compelling state interest and must do so in a narrowly tailored way, using the least restrictive means.

1. **Compelling interest is CGS 46-b120 and 129 that is all! True harms and abuse.**
2. **Next is you are setting two class of citizens standards' grandparents and other.**
3. **The truths are De-facto Parents and Parents are the only two that gets visitation rights and why not Fix CGS 46b-56 . and the courts are today Trashing one parents rights for visiting and parenting there children based of False allegations or easy lies that when caught the courts are not punishing.**
4. **Where is the compliancy of Title II of the ADA**

No administrative compliance = no ADA compliance = all persons and attorneys have been, are, and will continue to be excluded from participation, denied the benefits of services programs activities of Conn, and discriminated against by reason of disability by the public entity known as the Conn services to the Public.

Including but not limiting to the following:

Violation and non-compliance of Settlement Agreement between the United States Department of Justice and the Connecticut Judicial Branch, November 2003 and; Violations and non-compliance of Settlement Agreement in Raymond v. Rowland Civil Action NO. 3:03CV0118 (MRK) May 31, 2007 (Only 1 Conn. Administration)All of State Actors & Players and State Contractors whom with invidious animus intent, effect or both of

The right of the grandparent to visit the grandchild is not a constitutional right. Traditionally, the common law of the United States denied grandparents visitation with a child over a parent's objections.

Therefore grandparent visitation rights are merely Conn Stat-utory rights, given by State Actors and Players and Legislatures. AS A Un- Constitutional Right.

Historically, parental rights were universally recognized and protected under the U.S. Constitution. The current principle that only American laws only governs the relationship between parents and children in this country.

The Supreme Court's decision of *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, 268 U.S. 510 (1925), to declare that the liberty of parents to direct the upbringing and education of their children is a fundamental right.

In 1937, the Supreme Court found parental rights to be implicit in and protected by the Constitution (*Palko v. Connecticut*).

The 1972 *Wisconsin v. Yoder* decision (406 U.S. 205, 215) asserted that the "primary role of the parents in the upbringing of their children is now established beyond debate as an American tradition."

Russell v. SANILAC COUNTY Dist. Court, ED Michigan, 2015 - Google Scholar

... we have never held that any such right extends to grandparents.") (italics in original) (internal citation omitted); Brinkley v ... to grandparent visitation, Plaintiff cannot bring a Fourteenth Amendment Due Process claim regarding her canceled grandparent visitation rights, and thus ...

The Court in *Wisconsin v. Yoder*, 406 U.S. 205 (1972), to declare that parental rights, while very important, have limits.

The government may intervene when the interest is of the highest order and not otherwise served. This section is a correct statement of current law.

Today, when the government has proper evidence of child abuse or neglect, it may and should prosecute a parent who is responsible for such behavior.

Why does Office of Conn Legislative Researcher, Researcher Report 2015-R-0082 leave out the Costs of litigations' and Experts doctors, Findings of Facts for Any criminal history or history of physical, emotional, or sexual abuse or neglect by the petitioner and or who the Petitioner knows or is around past; (Child abuse was a daily thing in the 1900s to now - **grandparents generation**) how do you prove 2016? And how is the not a been a Financial burned on the children's Family and from ALL inherences' to the child , who wins the lawyer and doctors and GAL of the courts and Court Services and mandated programs cost?

Why are we not looking at Washington State, they are Equal and the Same, Common law states, as we are the Two Common Law states for family law. One would have to believe by Fact of Laws, We are not a **Holy Matrimony Family Law State** so stop looking at states that particles this type of laws. After all that is what is given us or corrupt/problematic Guardians Ad Litem (GAL) on the child's best interest

Washington State RCWs > Title 26 > Chapter 26.09 > Section 26.09.240
26.09.231 << 26.09.240 >> 26.09.255 RCW 26.09.240

Visitation rights—Person other than parent—Grandparents' visitation rights.

(1) A person other than a parent may petition the court for visitation with a child at any time or may intervene in a pending dissolution, legal separation, or modification of parenting plan proceeding. A person other than a parent may not petition for visitation under this section unless the child's parent or parents have commenced an action under this chapter.

(2) A petition for visitation with a child by a person other than a parent must be filed in the county in which the child resides.

(3) A petition for visitation or a motion to intervene pursuant to this section shall be dismissed unless the petitioner or intervenor can demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that a significant relationship exists with the child with whom visitation is sought. **If the petition or motion is dismissed for failure to establish the existence of a significant relationship, the petitioner or intervenor shall be ordered to pay reasonable attorney's fees and costs to the parent, parents, other custodian, or representative of the child who responds to this petition or motion.**

(4) The court may order visitation between the petitioner or intervenor and the child between whom a significant relationship exists upon a finding supported by the evidence that the visitation is in the child's best interests.

(5)(a) Visitation with a grandparent shall be presumed to be in the child's best interests when a significant relationship has been shown to exist. This presumption may be rebutted by a preponderance of evidence showing that visitation would endanger the child's physical, mental, or emotional health.

(b) If the court finds that reasonable visitation by a grandparent would be in the child's best interest except for hostilities that exist between the grandparent and one or